JA

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/810,283	03/26/2004	James W. Cannon	83094RRS	8578

7590 12/30/2005

Mark G. Bocchetti
Patent Legal Staff
Eastman Kodak Company
343 State Street
Rochester, NY 14650-2201

EXAMINER	
CHAKRABORTY, SUPRATIK	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2672	

DATE MAILED: 12/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/810,283	CANNON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Supratik Chakraborty	2672	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 March 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-46* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-46* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *1* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: On page 38, line 8, the sentence 'a controller adapted determine a set of portions of the original image' should be changed to 'a controller adapted to determine a set of portions of the original image'. Appropriate correction is required.

The numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. When claims are canceled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether entered or not).

Misnumbered claims 32-45 have been renumbered 33-46.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1,2,5-14,21-23,26-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nomura et al(Patent No. 5,877,772) in view of Sage et al(Patent No. 5,672,840) and further in view of Peters(Patent No. 5,715,334).

Regarding Claim 1, Nomura et al teach about

(1) A source of an original image (col.2, lines 37-40);

(2) A display (Fig.7, 76);

Nomura et al doesn't address the following limitations of the claim:

(3) A user input system adapted to generate a non-directional signal in response to a user input action.

(4) A controller adapted determine a set of portions of the original image where each portion including less than all of the original image and with the set having at least one portion that is non-central with respect to the original image and to successively designate a different one of a set of portions of the original image in response to each non-directional signal and adapted to cause the display to present a portion evaluation image showing the currently designated portion of the original image and to determine an area of importance in the original image based upon the currently designated portion; wherein each portion evaluation image shows the currently designated portion having a magnification, that is

greater than the magnification that the currently designated portion has when the currently designated portion is presented as a part of the original image.

Sage et al teach the limitation (3) of the claim.

In (col.3, lines 5-10), Sage et al. teach about a directional signal to redraw an image on a display. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to change the directional signal generation as taught by Sage et al to a user input system adapted to generate a non-directional signal in response to a user input action in order for the computer operator to provide directional information for the display change.

The combination of Nomura et al and Sage et al doesn't teach the limitation (4) of the claim.

Peters mentions the above limitation in (col.15, lines 40-45).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply within the combination of Nomura et al and Sage et al the method as taught by Peters in order to enhance and enlarge the interesting details.

Regarding Claim 2, Nomura et al teach that the controller is further adapted to generate area of importance data based upon determined area of importance and to associate the area of importance data with the original image (col.2, lines 25-28).

Regarding Claim 5, Nomura et al teach that the controller is further adapted to generate a revised image based upon image information from the area of importance and to store the revised image (col.2, lines 53-59). The reference teaches the holding means for temporarily holding a picture.

Regarding Claim 6, Nomura et al further teach that the controller is further adapted to resample the revised image so that the revised image has image characteristics that correspond to the image characteristics of the original image (col.2, lines 60-66). The reference teaches about determining the degree of importance based on the plurality of regions extracted which is analogous to sampling the image for image characteristics.

Regarding Claim 7, Sage et al teach that the non-directional signal comprises a start signal and an end signal generated in response to a user input action; and wherein the controller is adapted the start signal and, in response thereto, sequentially designate a different one of the set of portions of the original image and to cause the display to present an evaluation image showing each currently designated portion for a period of time, said sequence of designations ending when the end signal is generated, wherein the controller is further adapted to determine an area of importance in the original image based upon the portion that is designated when the end signal is generated (col.3, lines 5-11). Although the reference doesn't explicitly mention the start signal and the stop signal

generated in response to a user input action, it does talk about signals that would cause the display to be updated.

Regarding Claim 8, Sage et al teach that the non-directional signal comprises a start signal and an end signal, with the start signal being generated in response to a first user input action and an end signal being generated in response to a second user input action; and wherein the controller is adapted to detect at least one start signal and, in response thereto, provisionally designate a different one of the set of portions of the original image and to cause the display to present an evaluation image that shows each provisionally designated portion, wherein the controller is further adapted to detect the end signal and in response thereto, to determine an area of importance based upon the portion that is provisionally designated when the end signal is detected (col.3, lines 5-11).

Regarding Claim 9, Sage et al teach that the user input system is to generate a first non-directional signal in response to the user input action and the controller is further adapted to designate a first portion of the image in response thereto, wherein the controller is further adapted to receive subsequent non-directional signals and to provisionally designate a different portion of the original image in response to each subsequent non-directional signal, and wherein the controller determines that a portion is to be designated when an input signal is continual for a period of time longer than a predefined time period (col.3, lines 5-10). The

reference teaches about the redrawing of the display based on the input of a directional signal. Therefore, it might be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply within the invention of Sage et al the refreshing of the display based on a time constraint.

Regarding Claim 10, Nomura et al teach that the user input system generates a save input in response to a save user input action and, in response thereto, the controller uses the currently designated portion to determine an area of importance (col.2, lines 37-40). The reference teaches the picture holding means for temporarily holding the picture. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to have the picture holding means of the reference to save a picture in response to a save response user action.

Regarding Claim 11, Nomura et al teach that the user input system generates a reset signal in response to a reset user input action and the controller does not designate an area of importance for an image when a reset action is detected (col.13, lines 12-20). Nomura et al teaches about the edit region request that displays the picture stored temporarily and an input device can edit the displayed picture. Resetting is a form of editing where the previous image is replaced by a newer one. Therefore, it will be possible to use the edit request as a reset signal to not designate the area of importance or if the area of importance was present, to remove it.

Regarding Claim 12, Nomura et al teach that the set of predetermined portions of the original image include less than 10 portions (col.24, lines 60-63). The reference teaches the portioning the image into three regions a, b and c.

Regarding Claim 13, Peters teaches that the user input system is adapted to receive a magnification input and to generate a magnification signal in response thereto and wherein the controller is adapted to use more than one set of portions of image information from the original image with each set having at least one portion therein that is sized differently from at least one portion in another set of the more than one set of portions, and with the controller selecting one of the more than one set based upon the magnification input (col.15, lines 40-45). The reference teaches that the details of the image will be recognized and correlated with various image features, which can be done using the magnified portion of the image.

Regarding Claim 14, the combination of Nomura et al and Sage et al teach all the limitations of the claim.

(1) A source of an original image (Nomura et al, col.2, lines 37-40);

(2) A display (Nomura et al, Fig.7, 76);

(3) A user input system adapted to generate an advance signal (Sage et al, col.3, lines 5-10) and a save signal (Nomura et al, col.2, lines 37-40). Sage et al

doesn't explicitly mention the advance signal but it does mention the directional signals that update the display.

(4) A controller adapted to detect the advance signal and, in response thereto, to cause the display to present a sequence of portion evaluation images each representing the image content of one of a set of different portions of the original image with the predetermined set of portions including at least one portion that is non-central with respect to the original image, wherein the controller determines an area of importance in the original image based upon the portion of the original image presented when the controller detects the save signal (Sage et al, col.3 ,lines 5-10).

Regarding Claim 21, the combination of Nomura et al and Sage et al teach the limitations of the claim.

(1) A source of an original image (Nomura et al, col.2, lines 37-40).

(2) A display (Nomura et al, Fig.7, 76).

(3) A user input system adapted to generate a non-directional advance signal in response to a user input action (Sage et al, col.3, lines 5-10).

(4) A controller adapted to define a number of portion evaluation images each comprising image information from a portion of the original image with each portion being located relative to a predefined anchor point within the original image (Nomura et al, col.8, lines 54-57), with the controller further being adapted to cause a different portion evaluation image to be presented on the display in

response to each advance signal (Sage et al, col.3, lines 5-10) and with the controller additionally being adapted to determine from the non-directional advance signal, a user designation of a portion of the original image and to use the designation to determine an area of the importance in the original image (Sage et al, col.3 ,lines 5-10), wherein at least one anchor point is located so that at least one portion is non-central with respect to the original image (Nomura et al, col.8, lines 54-57). Although the reference (Nomura et al) doesn't mention the anchor points explicitly, it does talk about highlighting states of region based on the degrees of importance. Anchors are well known in the art to mark specific locations and thus at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to use the highlighting as taught by Nomura et al to use as an anchor.

Regarding Claim 22, Nomura et al teach that the user input system is adapted to receive a shape designation input and generate a shape signal and wherein the controller determines the shape of the portion within the original image based upon the shape signal (col.11, line 44). The reference teaches about the region specified within an image by a region extraction unit as specified by the user. A shape is known to be a two-dimensional or implied two-dimensional area defined by line or changes in value or color. Therefore it is possible to use the region extraction unit as taught by Nomura et al to receive a shape designation input and generate a shape signal.

Regarding Claim 23, Nomura et al teach that the controller is further adapted to generate area of importance data based upon the designated portion and to associate the area of importance data with the original image (col.2, lines 37-40).

Regarding Claim 26, Nomura et al teach that the controller is further adapted to generate a revised image based upon image information from area of importance (col.2, lines 60-66).

Regarding Claim 27, Nomura et al teach that the controller is further adapted to resample the revised image so that the revised image has image characteristics that correspond to the image characteristics of the original image (col.2, lines 60-66).

Regarding Claim 28, Peters teaches that the user input system receives a magnification input and generates a magnification signal in response thereto and wherein the controller determines the size of a portion within the original image based upon the magnification signal (col.15, lines 40-45).

Regarding Claim 29, Nomura et al teach that each portion is defined within the original image as comprising image information that is contained within a predetermined template located within the original image at a position located by

one of said anchor points (Fig.11, col.24, lines 49-53). The reference teaches a way to input region (shape) categories (predetermined templates) to be painted by a color. The variance of colors can be an indicator of various regions and thus can be used as anchors.

Regarding Claim 30, the combination of Nomura et al and Peters teach that each portion is defined within the original image as comprising image information that is contained within one of a set of differently sized templates located within the original image at a position defined by one of said anchor points (Nomura et al, col.24, lines 49-53), wherein one of the differently sized templates is selected by the controller based upon a magnification signal received from the user input system (Peters,col.15, lines 40-45).

Regarding Claim 31, Nomura et al teach the step of forming a revised image containing image information from the area of importance (col.2, lines 37-40).

Regarding Claim 32, Nomura et al teach the step of storing the revised image in place of the original image (col.2, lines 53-59). The reference teaches the holding means for temporarily holding or storing a picture or an image.

Regarding Claim 33, Peters teaches further comprising a zoom input generating a zoom signal wherein the relative proportion of the portion of the original image

used to form an evaluation image is determined based upon the zoom signal (col.15, lines 40-45). The reference teaches about the magnification but it can be used as a zoom functionality since it is well known in the art that zoom is to enlarge a portion of an image in order to see it more clearly or make it easier to alter.

Regarding Claim 34, the combination of Nomura et al, Sage et al and Peters teach the limitations of the claim.

(1) Obtaining an original image (Nomura et al, col.2, lines 37-40).

(2) Presenting an evaluation image having an appearance that corresponds to the original image (Nomura et al, col.2, lines 60-66).

(3) Defining a set of different portions in the original image, with each portion comprising less than all of the original image and at least one of the portions being non-central with the original image (Peters, col.15, lines 40-45).

(4) Detecting a non-directional user input action during presentation of the evaluation image. In (col.3, lines 5-10), Sage et al. teach about a directional signal to redraw an image on a display. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to change the directional signal generation as taught by Sage et al to a user input system adapted to generate a non-directional signal in response to a user input action in order for the computer operator to provide directional information for the display change.

(5) Designating one of the set of portions in response to each detected non-directional user input action presenting a portion evaluation image that corresponds to the designated portion with the portion evaluation image showing the currently designated portion having a magnification that is greater than the magnification that the designated portion has when the currently designated portion is presented as a part of the original image, and determining an area of importance based upon the designated portion (Peters, col.15, lines 40-45). The reference teaches that the details of the image will be recognized and correlated with various image features, which can be done using the magnified portion of the image.

Regarding Claim 35, Nomura et al teach the step of detecting a reset action during presentation of the portion evaluation image and in response thereto, designating a different one of the portions and presenting a portion evaluation image that corresponds to the different one of the portions (col.13, lines 12-20). Nomura et al teaches about the edit region request that displays the picture stored temporarily and an input device can edit the displayed picture. Resetting is a form of editing where the previous image is replaced by a newer one. Therefore, it will be possible to use the edit request as a reset signal to designate the area of importance.

Regarding Claim 36, Nomura et al teach that the step of defining a set of different portions in the original image comprises defining said portions based upon a predetermined pattern (Fig.11, col.24, lines 49-53). The reference teaches a way to input region (portions) categories (predetermined patterns) based on the original image.

Regarding Claim 37, Peters teaches that the step of defining a set of different portions in the original image comprises the steps of analyzing the image content of the original image and defining portions based upon the image analysis (col.15, lines 34-39). The references teaches three ways of image processing for analyzing the image contents:

1. Detail contrast enhancement.
2. Digital enlargements.
3. Noise management.

Regarding Claim 38, Peters teaches that the step of analyzing the image content of the original image comprises determining which portions of the original image are in focus, and defining the portions of the set of portions based upon the focus analysis (col.5, lines 32-43). The reference teaches a way of analyzing an image based on the full intensity of the human visual range and since maximum clarity or distinctness of an image rendered by an optical system is

known as focus, it is possible to use the image analysis method of Peters to do the focal analysis.

Regarding Claim 39, Nomura et al teach that the step of defining a set of different portions in the original image comprises the steps of receiving a user input action that designates an anchor point in the original image from a predefined set of anchor points and receiving a user input action that designates a portion shape to be located within the original image relative to the anchor point, wherein the designated portion comprises the portion of the original image contained within the portion shape as located relative to the anchor point (Nomura et al, col.8, lines 54-57). Although the reference (Nomura et al) doesn't mention the anchor points explicitly, it does talk about highlighting states of region based on the degrees of importance. Anchors are well known in the art to mark specific locations and thus at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to use the highlighting as taught by Nomura et al to use as an anchor.

Regarding Claim 40, Peters teaches that the different portions in the original image comprises the steps of analyzing information used in a capture step in which the original images captured to define the set of portions (col.18, lines 21-29). The reference mentions selective extraction of details and this teaching can be used to analyze the original image.

Regarding Claim 41, Peters teaches that the step of defining a set of different portions in the original image comprises analyzing the original image to identify potential subjects in the original image and defining portions that correspond to the identified potential subjects (col.18, lines 21-29). The reference mentions selective extraction of details and this teaching can be used to analyze the original image to identify potential subjects in the original image and defining portions that correspond to the identified potential subjects.

Regarding Claim 42, Peter teaches that the step of defining a set of different portions in the original image comprises analyzing the original image to identify illumination patterns within the original image and defining a portion based upon one or more detected patterns (col.18, lines 21-29). The reference mentions selective extraction of details and this teaching can be used to analyze the original image to identify illumination patterns, which is a degree of visibility on the image and thus is differentiable.

Regarding Claim 43, Peters teaches that the step of defining a set of different portions of the original image comprises analyzing the original image to determine potential subject areas and defining a portion for each determined potential subject area (col.18, lines 21-29). The reference mentions selective extraction of details and this teaching can be used to analyze the original image

to identify potential subjects in the original image and defining portions that correspond to the identified potential subjects.

Regarding Claim 44, the combination of Nomura et al, Sage et al and Peters teach the limitations of the claim.

(1) Obtaining an original image (Nomura et al, col.2, lines 37-40).

(2) Displaying an evaluation image of the original image (Nomura et al, col.2, lines 60-66).

(3) Detecting an advance user input action that does not include a directional input relative to the displayed evaluation image (Sage et al, col.3, lines 5-10).

(4) Selecting a sequence of different portions from a set of different portions of the original image in response to the advance user input action (Sage et al, col.3, lines 5-10).

(5) Presenting, for each selected portion, a portion evaluation image that indicates the image information in the original image that is contained within the currently designated portion (Peters, col.18, lines 21-29).

(6) Detecting a save user input action (Nomura et al, col.2, lines 37-40) and determining an area of importance based upon the selected portion displayed when the save input user action is detected, wherein at least one of the predetermined set of portions of the original image is non-central with respect to the original image (Peters, col.15, lines 40-45).

Regarding Claim 45, Sage et al teach that the step of selecting at least one portion comprises receiving at least one advance signal and designating a different one of the set of portions in response to each advance signal (col.3, lines 5-10).

Regarding Claim 46, the combination of Sage et al and Nomura et al teach that the steps of selecting at least one portion of a set of different portions of the original image based upon the user input action, and presenting, for each selected portion, a portion evaluation image that indicates the image information in the original image that is contained within the currently designated portion comprise presenting a sequence of portion evaluation images including each of the portions in the set of different portions (Sage et al, col.3, lines 5-10) and detecting a save user input action during presentation of one of the portion evaluation images (Nomura et al, col.2, lines 37-40).

Claims 3,4,24, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nomura et al(Patent No. 5,877,772) in view of Sage et al(Patent No. 5,672,840) and further in view of Peters(Patent No. 5,715,334) as applied to claims 1,2,5-14,21-23,26-46 above and further in view of Phillips (Patent No. 6,504,552).

Regarding Claim 3, the combination of Nomura et al, Sage et al and Peters does not teach the limitation of the claim the controller associates the area of importance data with the original image by storing the area of importance data as metadata in a digital image that comprises the original image.
Phillips teaches the above limitation in (col.3, lines 12-18).
Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply within the combination of Nomura et al, Sage et al and Peters the storing the area as metadata as taught by Phillips in order to have descriptive information on the image such as positional information.

Regarding Claim 4, Phillips teaches the controller associates the area of importance data with the original image by storing the area of importance data as metadata on a photosensitive film bearing the original image (col.3, lines 43-51). The reference teaches that the metadata can be provided to the camera where the images can be analog or digital.

Regarding Claim 24, Phillips teaches that the controller associates the area of importance data with the original image by storing the area of importance data as metadata in a digital image that comprises the original image (col.3, lines 12-18).

Regarding Claim 25, Phillips teaches that the controller associates the area of importance data with the original image by storing the area of importance data as metadata on a photosensitive film bearing the original image (col.3, lines 43-51).

Claims 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nomura et al(Patent No. 5,877,772) in view of Sage et al(Patent No. 5,672,840) and further in view of Peters(Patent No. 5,715,334).

Regarding Claim 15, the combination of Nomura et al and Sage et al teach the limitations of the claim except that that the source of an original image comprises an image capture system. Phillips teaches that the source of an original image comprises an image capture system (col.3, lines 44-46). The reference teaches about how the embodiment comprises of a camera. Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to apply within the combination of Nomura et al and Sage et al, the image capture system as taught by Philips in order to provide the metadata to the camera and to the subsequent images that the camera will output.

Regarding Claim 16, Nomura et al teach that the controller is adapted to cause the display to present an evaluation image that has an appearance that corresponds to the appearance of the original image and to receive signals from the user input system during presentation of the evaluation image (Fig.7, 76).

Fig.7 teaches that the display of the evaluation image (Fig.7, 76) can have a user input attached to it (Fig.7, 77).

Regarding Claim 17, Nomura et al teach that the controller forms each image in the sequence of images that sequentially designate a set of portions of the original image by forming indicia in the designated portions of the evaluation image that indicate the portion that is currently being designated (col.16, lines 46-64). The reference teaches how the various regions are designated using various colors.

Regarding Claim 18, Nomura et al teach that the controller forms each portion evaluation image so that it incorporates only image information from the currently selected portion (col.16, lines 50-57). The reference teaches the use of the mouse to designate the portions and incorporate information using various colors.

Regarding Claim 19, Nomura et al teach that the end signal comprises the absence of the start signal (Fig.15). If the flowchart of Fig. 15 is implemented on software/hardware it is up to the inventor's discretion to separate the start signal and end signal such that the end signal doesn't comprise of the start signal.

Regarding Claim 20, Nomura et al teach that the user input system is adapted to generate the start signal in response to one user input action and the end signal in response to a different user input action (Fig.7). The figure (Fig.7) teaches that the two different user actions will result in either the start or the stop.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Supratik Chakraborty whose telephone number is (703) 272-7662. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (7:30 am - 3:30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Razavi can be reached on (703) 272-7664. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SC
S.Chakraborty
12/8/2005

RICHARD HJERPE 12/12/05
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600